Talcher-Gopalpur survey. Unfortunately, these things have been neglected. It could have been the easiest way of transporting coal to Madras and other places. But this is all forgotten. Then, though Talcher will be the terminal point, Sambalpur has not been connected. I would, therefore, like to urge upon the hon. Minister to see that in future if we want a healthy development of the Railways, full economic development of the nation and national integration, these pockets of backwardness are not continued for ever, and they must see the light of the day, for which the Railways must plan boldly. We are still under the colonial impression of the Railways connecting metropolitan cities by double line or three lines. To solve the transport problem I would like to suggest—today the Jamshedpur—Rourkela is a congested line—you have another line from Kharagpur to Jamshedpur and .... *(Time Bellrings)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Mr. Sahu, do you need more time?

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR SAHU: Yes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Now there is a statement to be made. After the statement we will continue.

Statement by Minister re: Foreign Secretary's visit to us

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO):

Sir, I rise to make a statement on the recent visit of the Foreign Secretary to the USA and other related issues which have been raised during Zero Hour in the past few days.

Foreign Secretary visited Washington, March 9—11, for talks on matters of mutual interest. Indo-US consultations at the Foreign Secretary's level are a regular feature in our bilateral relations and generally cover the whole gamut of Indo-US ties.

Honourable Members have in the past few days raised a number of pertinent issues relating to Indo-US relations. I would now like to address some of them specifically.

PENTAGON PAPER

Honourable Members made reference to the so-called Pentagon Paper, extracts of which appeared in the US press on March 8, 1992. The paper is actually a draft which outlines USA's perceptions and strategies in relation to the entire world. The report is not a specific position paper on India or Pakistan. However, the paragraphs of particular concern to India, as they appeared in newspapers in the United States are the following:

"We will seek to prevent the further development of a nuclear arms race on the Indian subcontinent. In this regard, we should work to have both countries, India and Pakistan, adhere to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and to place their nuclear energy facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. We should discourage Indian hegemonic aspirations over the other states in South Asia and on the Indian Ocean. With regard to Pakistan, a constructive US-Pakistan military relationship will be an important element in our strategy to promote stable security conditions in Southwest Asia and Central Asia. We should therefore endeavour to rebuild our military relationship given acceptable resolution of our nuclear concerns." and, there is another quotation which I would like to place before the House:

"The US may be faced with the question of whether to take up military steps to prevent the development of use of weapons of mass destruction....."

The Foreign Secretary was instructed to immediately take up these negative references to India. In his meetings with Deputy Secretary Eagleburger and Under Secretary of Defence Wolfowite, Foreign Secretary conveyed our serious concerns on the above. He was informed that this document was draft paper prepared by middle level Pentagon officials and would be subject to review and modification. India's concerns have been noted by the US and modifications would be made to take them into account. Foreign Secretary was

categorically told that there was no perception at US policy-making levels which reflected the negative references to India contained in the Pentagon paper. Officials of both the State Department and the National Security Council with whom Foreign Secretary raised India's concerns, informed him that the paper does not reflect the position of the US on various issues dealt with and that it is subject to further review.

On the reported Pentagon advocacy for a continued substantial US military relationship with Pakistan, Foreign Secretary strongly conveyed our views that while it was a bilateral matter between the United States and Pakistan, this would naturally have consequences in terms of Indian assessments and policy orientation.

INDIA'S POSITION ON NPT AND 5-POWER CONFERENCE

I would now like to take up the issue of India's position regarding the Non-Proliferation Treaty. There have been some misleading reports that have appeared in the press that India would sign the NPT. Some Honourable Members had raised this specifically in Parliament. I would like to categorically state that there is no change in India's position with regard to the NPT. In Washington, the Foreign Secretary reaffirmed our position that India would not sign the NPT since it considered the treaty to be discriminatory. The Foreign Secretary unambiguously put forward India's views in this regard.

I would like to make a clear distinction between India's position on the NPT and her position in nuclear non-proliferation. India has always been against the proliferation of nuclear weapons and her record in this regard is second to none. Speaking at the Security Council on January 31, 1992, Prime Minister had set out India's views in this regard. He recalled the Action Plan for Disarmament put forward at the Third Special Session on Disarmament in 1988 by the late Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi which sought to eliminate all weapons of mass destruction in stages, eventually leading to a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world. PM said and I quote:

"The Plan contained all the key elements of a new international consensus on nuclear non-proliferation. First, it called for the conclusion of an international convention on the prohibition of the use of threat of use of nuclear weapons. Second, it advocated a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Third, threshold states would undertake obligations not to cross the threshold, and this would be linked to corresponding obligations by nuclear-weapon states to eliminate their nuclear arsenals by the year 2010 at the latest."

The Prime Minister in fact at the meeting which I have mentioned advocated advancing this time-frame to the year 2000. The House is aware that on the issue of signing the NPT, India has been under pressure for several years past, including pressure from the erstwhile Soviet Union. We have consistently taken a principled stand to the effect that while the treaty is discriminatory, what is needed is total and complete nuclear disarmament, brought about by balanced, simultaneous, comprehensive and time-bound measures on the lines advocated by India's Action Plan presented at the Third Special session of the UN on Disarmament in 1988. The copies of this Plan, Sir, are available in the Parliament Library. As the House is aware, at that point of time, it was also laid on the Table. The Prime Minister has elaborated India's stand on all occasions when the matter was raised both in multilateral meetings and bilateral talks.

Honourable Members had also referred to the 5-Power Conference proposal put forward by the United States to discuss security issues, including nuclear non-proliferation in South Asia. During his meeting with President Bush in New York on January 31, 1992, Prime Minister detailed Government's position on this. The Prime Minister told President Bush that India was concerned about uncontrolled proliferation of nuclear weapons and did not see how this new phenomenon could be stopped merely by measures of policing. Proliferation had taken on a global dimension and required a global approach. India was prepared to talk to

: US on non-proliferation but given the actical situation and ground realities. dia had to consider on how to deal with : problem. This reality could hardly be alt with in a meeting of 5 states as such neeting could become only an exercise acrimony.

In Washington, Foreign Secretary iterated India's stand on the above lines regard to talking bilaterally with the S on the latter's concerns on nuclear n-proliferation.

IDO-US NAVAL EXERCISES

Some Honourable Members had ferred to the proposal for Indo-US joint val exercises. India has defence operation with several friendly untries, including the United States. do-US defence cooperation is focussed exchange of professional information, gh level visits and training. In this ntext, joint training exercises will be dertaken by he Indian and US Navies. is the Government's view that these aining exercises would be professionally seful to our Navy. No agreement has en signed in this regard. I wish to state at the Indian Navy has recently nducted an exercise with the Australian avy.

India remains committed to the Indian cean being an area without conflict. dia would like to see the maintenance f peace and stability in the Indian Ocean gion, free from intimidation or rivalry pursuance of the objectives outlined in e 1971 Declaration of the Indian Ocean s a zone of peace.

NDIA'S POSITION ON SPECIAL 301

Honourable Members are aware that e Special 301 investigation against India n the issue of Intellectual Property ights has been terminated. The United tates Trade Representative had, owever, announced on 26 February, 992 that an Inter-Agency Committee ill be mandated to develop options for ossible implementation and action if the acts so warrant. Honourable Members now that trade—related IPR issues are eing discussed and negotiated in the ATT under the Uruguay Round of ultilateral Trade Negotiations. It is in his context that Foreign Secretary has onveyed that Indo-US consultations ould continue at the Uruguay Round to narrow down differences wherever possible.

CONCLUSION

The talks that Foreign Secretary conducted with US officials were in a spirit of mutual understanding and friendliness. These talks will continue.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Now the clarifications. Shri Yashwant Sinha.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, at the outset, I would like to say that the statement is not as clear and as categorical as one would have expected it to be on the points which were raised in this House on Friday. That is why I am seeking very specific clarifications from the Minister and I hope that in the course of his reply, it will be possible for him to give me specific replies in regard to specific questions.

Now about the first point, the Pentagon Paper. From the excerpts which have been quoted in the statement of the Minister—both parts of it—I would like to say that they are not—whether prepared at any level, middle level or the juniormost level, let me make it very clear, and they cannot be the observations of a friendly power. These observations are extremely unfriendly and extremely damaging to a country like India. It is all right to say that this is only a middle level official paper and that it does not reflect the U.S. policy. I have here a newspaper report which says, despite whatever assurances may have been given to our Foreign Secretary, again by officials or the functionaries junior to the Defence Secretary, Dick Cheney, that President Bush himself has said that he is broadly in agreement with the approach of the Pentagon Paper, and that the U.S. Defence Secretary said that he is going to approve the paper only with minor modifications.

Therefore, my specific question to the hon. Minister is: What are these minor changes? Is the newspaper report about what President Bush has said correct? If that is so, do these minor changes alter their position which was reflected in this paper in regard to India, or, the Indian subcontinent, including the threat of

military intervention for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction that they might perceive we may have? This is a specific question that I would like to ask.

The second part of my question relating to this itself is this. According to the statement made by the hon. Minister, "...the Foreign Secretary strongly conveyed our views that while it was a bilateral matter between the United States and Pakistan, this would naturally have consequences in terms of India's assessments and policy orientation." The statement stops there. Like in the first part, it does not say what was the response of the U.S. officials. When our Foreign Secretary raised this point, how did the U.S. officials responds? Did they say that they will not follow this policy in future, that the military support which they have been extending to Pakistan will also not be there in future, that the Pressler Amendment will apply in full measure, and that no clandestine arms supply to Pakistan will take place? This is a shortcoming in this statement. I hope the hon. Minister will specifically clarify this point also.

Now, about the NPT. We all understand about our position in regard to the NPT and our position in regard to non-proliferation. This was also the question which was stated by the hon. Prime Minister at the U.N. Security Council summit. But on the question of the five-nation security conference, which is going to discuss—or, if ever held, will discuss—these questions, including the question of non-proliferation and the question of nuclear free zone in South Asia, the position continues to be vague. That is why I said that we could have been far more categorical in this. My point is, if we are not going to sign the NPT, if we are not going to change our traditional position, what is it that we are going to discuss? The Minister has said that, earlier, there were two super-powers and that we were under pressure from both of them, but we did not buckle under that pressure. We maintained our stand that we will not sign the NPT. Now, there is only one super-power and we are under pressure from that super-power to sign the NPT. The hon. Minister says that we are not going to sign the NPT. My question is, if we are not going to sign the NPT, what is it that we are going to discuss, bilaterally, with the U.S.? The newspaper report used the words in quotes, from the Foreign Secretary's interview in Washington, that "substantive discussions would be held on this question with the U.S." What is the meaning of these words, "substantive discussions" on a bilateral basis with the U.S. if our position is very clear that we are not going to sign the NPT? Did not the Foreign Secretary tell them? Did not the others have time enough in Washington to tell them? When the U.S. officials visited India, did we not tell them clearly what our position was? What is the substantive discussions that we are going to hold in the next eight weeks with the U.S. in regard to the NPT?

In regard to the five-nation summit, the Minister has reiterated the position the Prime Minister took in his discussions with the U.S. President when he went to the U.S.A. in January. And we are talking of vague things like 'ground realities', this, that and the other. I would like the hon. Minister to state categorically in this House whether we are going to participate in the five-nation summit or not. Originally, this idea of a five—nation summit came from Pakistan. This was not a U.S. idea. The original idea came from Pakistan. The U.S. picked it up. They are now pressurising us to join in this summit. I would like to know—whether it results in acrimony or anything else—categorically what is India's position. Are we going to join in this conference? If we are not going to join in this conference, did our Foreign Secretary tell the U.S that there was not question of joining in this five-nation summit, or, altering our position in regard to global non-proliferation? I say this because, in the interview which the Foreign Secretary gave to the Washington Post people and in his meeting with Indian correspondents, unfortunately, he had given two different signals, which is causing so much confusion. That confusion, unfortunately, has not been cleared by the Minister's statement.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA: The other point that I want to raise is in regard to naval exercise. Even in regard to the naval exercise, our Foreign

Secretary has said and the newspapers have quoted him—under quotes— "That he has said that it will not be held in the middle of the Indian Ocean, it will be held in our coastal waters". Is it the Government's intention that the naval exercise will be held in the coastal waters of India and what are the implications of holding a naval exercise with the U.S. in the coastal waters of India? We have held naval exercise, as the Minister has said, with Australia, but I would say that there is a difference between marrying Hidumba and marrying an ordinary lady. You are getting into a situation where without being a Bhim you are going to marry Hidumba. Do you realise what state is going to overtake you? That is the possible result of cooperation in the military field with the U.S.

Then you have talked about training. I would like to know, how many people have been trained from our armed forces in the U.S. so far, and how many people are likely to be trained in future?

One more point and I will be done and that is in regard to the Super 301. Again the statement of the Minister, unfortunately, is very vague. I would like to know whether, when the Foreign Secretary met the U.S. trade representative, he was threatened, whether he was categorically told that India is not realy off the hook and that if we did not behave in regard to free trade and in regard to trade-related intellectual property, the U.S. action will start again. Was he told this categorically? And it was only in reply to that threat he said that we shall continue our discussions in the GATT round. The point is that there is a GATT round, and it has appeared even in the Indian newspaper that the U.S. is adopting a strong arm tactics, that it is trying to achieve through its domestic laws, national laws, what is only permissible under international law, under the GATT framework. This bilateral arm twisting, this bilateral threatening under Super 301 is most undersirable. I would like the Minister to state categorically whether such a threat was held out when the Foreign Secretary met the U.S. trade representative.

The last point is, we have seen reports that in the course of a search for North Korean ship—this is the point which I raised in this House the other day—the U.S. Naval Chief has stated that they had the Indian coast as well as Pakistan coast under surveillance in order to go in search for this North Korean ship. The Minister has not covered that in his statement, but I would like to know from him whether the Government has found out from the US authorities as to what kind of surveillance were the Indian coastal waters subjected to. What is the reaction of the Government of India to this kind of surveillance in our coastal waters? This kind of surveillance is like having a surveillance on our physical territory. Are we going to accept this kind of surveillance by the U.S.?

In the end, I would say, the reason why we are very concerned about this is the fact that we are not able to deal with the U.S on the basis of sovereign equality, the point which I had made earlier in this House when I was intervening in the debate on Motion of Thanks to the President. I will repeat that we are behaving like a vassal State, like a suabservient State of the U.S., we are not dealing with them on an equal plane. I will be very happy if the Minister could stand up in this House and say that as a proud country of 850 million people we shall deal with the US like we shall deal with all other countries in the world, on the basis of equality, on the basis of honour, on the basis of dignity.

SHRI KAPIL VERMA (Uttar Pradesh): Thank you very much, Mr. Vice-Chairman. The hon. Minister's statement, in fact, does not contain very much new. We all know what has stated.

The first point that I would like to touch—to avoid repetition is the fact which everybody knows and which has been discussed in the US Senate also, that is, private sales on private account of arms, weapons and technology to Pakistan. In fact, I am very clear in my mind that the United States has turned a Nelson's eye to what Pakistan is doing about its nuclear arms programme.

In fact, weapons are being supplied, continued to be supplied to Pakistan, and even nuclear technology is being given to it by the United States, but we are being asked to sign the NPT. Pakistan is

blackmailing the United States. In fact, if we sign the NPT, Pakistan will continue its clandestine programmes, and we will be at a great disadvantage because both China and Pakistan have targeted India as far as their nuclear weapons are concerned.

Sir, I would not quote anybody else but the Director of CIA, Mr. Gates, who has said in his testimony, not privately, but in testimony to the US Congress, Senate, that Pakistan was equipping its F-16 aircraft with a delivery system and that it was getting technology. Our Minister may be knowing, Mr. Glen, the Chairman of the Government Affairs Committee of the Senate has regretted that efforts are being made by the Administration to thwart—he has used the word "thwart"—the Pressler Amendment and all its restrictions. In short, I would say that on the one hand the USA is telling us all kinds of things, giving all kinds of assurance, and on the other hand it is privately arming Pakistan, and the Pressler Amendment has been brought to a naught. It is the same thing whether you catch the nose from this side or from the other side. So, their assurances, to me at least, do not amount to much. I want to know from the Minister very clearly whether discussions will be held with the Foreign Secretary to discuss the question of sale of arms, though on private account, to Pakistan and the continued flow of nuclear technology to Pakistan. So, as far as Pakistan is concerned, there is no difference in this situation.

Sir, another thing that I would like to ask is about the Pentagon Papers. You may call it "a draft." But how important and how powerful Pentagon is in the United States, the whole world knows. I need not say anything. This is the attitude of Pentagon. I have also read the statement which Mr. Sinha has read in the newspapers. It has not been so far denied by any American spokesman. Mr. Bush has said, "I am in broad agreement with it, and if necessary...." — he has used the words "if necessary" — "will act on it." So, I want to know from the Minister very specifically, very categorically whether he has received any assurance from President Bush in his talks with the US officials that he has been wrongly quoted and that his vie were different. If he has been wron quoted, how is it that the Americ Administration which is very quick deny things, has not denied it?

I would also like to know from t Government whether there is a alternative proposal on the NPT so th the discriminatory part of it is remov because some of the big powers want to continue after 1995 definitely. We not want it. We have said, "No. Y limit it to a certain period on a nc discriminatory basis."

Only two minutes more.

I would like to say that as far as t Foreign Secretary's statement concerned, I am glad that the Forei Secretary has given an account of wh he has said, but a lot of confusion w caused about the five-nation conferen which is proposed to be held because t Foreign Secretary was quoted by even t Indian Press as saying that we are "V are not attending it now, and it depen on the terms of reference." This is with quotes in the newspapers. I want to assured that it is a wrong quotation.

I want the Minister to categorica state whether he completely rules c participation in the Conference.

Lastly, I would conclude by saying th the Foreign Secretary while coming ba from there visited London and met sor Labour Members of Parliament. There discussed with those Labour Members Parliament, who said the Europe Parliament had passed resolutio supporting the Pakistani stand abc Kashmir, indirectly, of course. I ha seen papers. They are with me. So, won't take time. This causes us gre concern because of their support for th right of self-determination and the s called violation of human rights. So, would like to know whether the Forei Secretary took up this question with t British Government and what was th response.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Andh Pradesh): We have been told by t Minister in the course of the Stateme that this Pentagon paper was only a dra I would like to know whether it wou have been described as draft if it had n been published in a newspaper. Since t

document found its way to a US paper, the US Government obviously had no option but to fall back upon the definition that this was nothing more than a middle level document. We know, Sir, what happened when both late Nehru and late Kennedy met. At the end of that meeting we Indians — I was a young man in my 20s— felt the result of that meeting was extremely positive and historic, but ten years later we learnt through secret papers that President Kennedy was totally disappointed and decided not to set any store by their relationship with India. Fortunately, for us — and not only for us, but for the whole world — the paper came to be leaked. What does this paper indicate? It indicates the new mind-set of the United States. Practically we are living in a uni-polar world and the United States is keen on ensuring the perpetuation of the present unipolar global position. With this objective in view, they want to take all steps to pre-empt the emergence of a possible rival for the United States in any form at the global level. We all know the US economy has been declining very fast and they are trying to bolster up the US economy through their military and technological power.

Coming to the Indian sub-continent, the view expressed in the Pentagon Paper is really frightening. On account of a number of false, vacuous postures and gestures, euphoria has been generated in the country that Indo-US relations have turned dramatically for the better, but the paper pleads that the relationship with Pakistan in military terms should continue to be strengthened. At this point of time I do not know how the Government can justify Indo-US Naval exercises.

Now, coming to the question of nuclear proliferation treaty, I think the whole question has become outdated today. There are loose nuclear bombs, loose nuclear fissionable materials and loose nuclear scientists available for sale in the erstwhile USSR today. This is the greatest danger that the globe is facing. The United States wants us to turn a blind eye to that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): The point is, you don't turn it into a debate. You just ask a clarification....(*Interruptions*)....

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: The United States wants us to turn a Nelson's eye to this explosive nuclear situation in the erstwhile USSR. May I bring to the notice of the House that when the United States says that the nuclear weapons are safe in the United States, it is referring to the strategic weapons, whose number is known. Their number is 12000. But nobody knows about the fate of thousands of tactical nuclear weapons. The Chief of Army of the former Soviet Union said: "We must be having 15000 tactical nuclear weapons. Give or take 5000 weapons." That is the dangerous situation in which the whole globe is finding itself.

I would like to know as to whether our Prime Minister took advantage of the recent U.N. Security Council summit to raise this most important question.

I would like to know whether the Foreign Secretary or the Prime Minister in their bilateral talks with the United States authorities raised this important question.

Now, I am coming to the 5-Power Conference. We have been told in the statement as to what the Prime Minister has said, as to what the Foreign Secretary has said, but we have not been told as to what has been the response from the other side. Are you conducting a dialogue or are you indulging in a monologue with the United States or do you want to keep us in the dark in regard to the other side of the picture or are we to learn from some other leakage in the United States newspapers? We are totally opposed to 5-Power Conference because we have been opposing this on the ground that it would be a regional variant of NPT. If a nuclear conference is to be held in this part of the world, it should include China and Indian Ocean. Did you say that the conference should be expanded so as to include China, Japan and the Indian Ocean?

May I tell you, dear friends, that Japan which has been a non-belligerent nation is today spending $33 billion on defence. Japan is the second biggest defence spender. Therefore, did you tell the United States that for any meaningful

nuclear proliferation talks in this part of the world, that is, in Asia-Pacific, Japan, China and the Indian Ocean should be included? If you did not do so, why did you not do so?

Now, about India's position on Special-301, I think, there is no need for them to enforce it. We have been conceding all the requests. We have allowed United States Kellogg Company to enter India in the area of breakfast cereals. We have allowed Coca-Cola company. You cannot cite these as an achievement at all. In fact, if the termination of these talks is of temporary kind...

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY (Uttar Pradesh): What type of a query is he putting? We should be able to follow it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): It is for the Minister. He has followed it....(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH (Maharashtra): Since Mr. Yashwant Sinha has gone and sat there, these interruptions are taking place. Seems to be some sort of nexus there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please conclude.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I know this for a fact that wherever Mr. Yashwant Sinha may find himself, he will be advancing my case. He will be doing my job there. He is doing my job there (*Interruptions*).

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: आपके लोग भी टूटेंगे। आप का हम इधर स्वागत करते हैं। **(व्यवधान)**

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Well, you are inviting me and you are being invited by the United States. You have to respond to their invitation also (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER. Mr. Reddy, you are an old Congressman.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I am also restating the old Congress positions which are being abandoned by the Congress party. (*Interruptions*).

DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY: .....We want to see you as the Minister of External Affairs.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Mr Reddy, please conclude now.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Sir, this House would like to know ...(*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Mr. Reddy, we are really short of time.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: This is too important a matter. I cannot even frame questions unless I narrate the background. (*Interruptions*). I cannot even formulate a question unless I narrate the background. I am on my last point. That is with regard to the Special 301. What is the position of the Government in regard to Dunkel's proposals? It is often stated in this House that it will be discussed in Parliament. The Cabinet Sub-Committee itself has recommended a debate in Parliament. Dunkel's proposals in short amount to globalisation of Super and Special 301s. So I would like to know what the position of the Government is. Thank you.

SHRI A.G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Sir, when this issue was raised last week, it was observed that there was a confusion in the reports coming from the United States attributed to our Foreign Secretary. It seems from the statement of the hon. Minister that he has also given categorical information on various issues at various times regarding the NPT, 301, military exercises, etc.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I want to request the hon. Member who is sitting with the 'brigade' now.....(*Interruptions*).

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: He is saying that you are sitting with the 'brigade'.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): What did you say, Mr. Kulkarni?

SHRI A.G. KULKARNI: With regard to the statements made by one of my colleagues from here, who is sitting in the 'brigade area', which is the 'cantonment area' of this House...(*Interruptions*).

Sir, I am very serious on this point where Mr. Yashwant Sinha and Mr. Jaipal Reddy and many other colleagues at various places are expressing a doubt

whether the Government will uphold the honour of this country. Sir, I am very sorry that of late, after the World Bank, etc. etc., a tendency is being perpetuated whereby we use very provocative words and people get confused. Hon. Members can make whatever points they may have. But the Government is strong enough. As the Prime Minister, while replying to the debate on the Motion of Thanks to the President, has stated, nobody can take out the honour of this country. (*Interruption*).

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN : Is he seeking or giving clarifications? (*Interruptions*).

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: I am seeking clarifications. But, as Mr. Jaipal Reddy has stated, some background has to be given. My colleague, Shrimati Jayanthi Natarajan, will also speak and she will also do the same thing. She will also do the same thing. Mr. Vice-Chairman, my clarifications are: number one, the report which has come in the *Washington Post, The New York Times etc.* states that while the Foreign Secretary was giving an interview on NPT etc., it is attributed to the Foreign Secretary as having said, "within eight weeks, we will meet again." Is it for bilateral discussion on security perceptions excluding the NPT or what type of discussion he wanted to have bilaterally? A categorical reply from the Government will remove the confusion.

Secondly, as my friend, Dr. S. Jaipal Reddy said and I am also afraid that in the High-Power Conference, this problem cannot be solved. Now it has already gone beyond the hands of various powers since the USSR is having a nuclear pile. How they are going to use it, nobody can have any perception. I would like to know whether the Government has discussed this matter with the USSR and the USA, this question of nuclear proliferation and liberalisation of nuclear technology availability.

The third point is about 301. About 301, the Government is all along stating that the Dunkel proposals and the related matters are being discussed in the Cabinet. But we are making a mountain of a molehill. I would like to know whether this Madam Carla Hills is a tigress or an elephant. Why we are so much afraid of that lady, I don't understand. Why do you take to your heart that she has threatened Mr. Dixit? Has she threatened him with a gun or a revolver? I do not know that. But the Government could have easily stated that the discussions on the Dunkel proposals, the GATT and the Super-301, are going on. Let us not pressurise the Government either to reject them or to accept them. We should take an objective view. In this connection, what is the view of the Government and what is the objective criterion on the Dunkel proposals, the GATT and the Super 301?

The last point is about surveillance. I agree that surveillance on military exercises is carried on for years together with various nations. My friend, Mr. Sinha, stated that America had arranged a surveillance for a Korean ship carrying mines or whatever equipment they had, in India and Pakistan, both. I would like to know whether the Government will enlighten us on that so that the people at large will be satisfied.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHAKSAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Before I call the next speaker, I will announce that the discussion on the Railway Budget remains inconclusive. It will be taken up tomorrow. (*Interruptions*).

Now, Shri Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, how has the time been allotted? It was decided that from each party, two speakers ..... (*Interruptions*).

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, do you mean to say that clarifications will be taken up tomorrow or at the end of the Railway Budget today? (*Interruptions*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASOKDAR): Yes. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, in the Business Advisory Committee, it was agreed that

the number of speakers for parties would be restricted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASOKDAR): That is being restricted. Shri Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi.

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI (Rajasthan): Sir, I would like to submit for the consideration of the Government that it is not a very happy precedent that a Foreign Minister is giving a statement on the record of the talks of a Foreign Secretary or the Defence Minister will issue a statement on the record of discussions or interviews of a Defence Commander. This is not a very happy precedent. I wish that the Government should take note of it ...(*interruption*)...

Regarding the so-called Pentagon papers, the statement has cleverly avoided to give a categorical reply. The statement has described it as a specified position paper. This is not the correct position. The newspaper has said, "And what else it can be if it is not a specific position?" It discourages Indian hegemonic aspirations over the other states. This is insulting and unfolding the design to curb India's image as a regional power even in the region. Sir, the USA or any other country has never reconciled to the growing influence of India and when they have accepted that on paper, I would like to know from the Government what India has to say about it and whether this Government aspires to make this country if not a world power, then at least a regional power.

My second question is this. We want to treat it very lightly by describing it as a document. Was it a draft paper prepared by a middle level Pentagon official? If this was a draft paper prepared by a middle level Pentagon official, it has confirmed our earlier apprehensions about the statements issued by the various Presidents and high officials of the Government of USA. Therefore, there was no perception at US policy-making levels which reflected the negative reference of India. That statement has said so. We have been hearing from the higher level about the US attitude towards India. It only confirms their earlier policies advocated time and again. I would like to know from the Government very specifically how they respond to this US design.

About the Indo-US joint naval exercise, what I would like to submit is that with the former USSR we had the best of relations and especially on naval side, but we never had a joint naval exercise. I would like to know what led this Government to take a joint naval exercise. This is a very dangerous thing, Sir, and I would urge the Government to clarify its stand. For decades and decades we had very intimate relations with the former USSR Government, but this is a very new found love with USA. Sir, we must understand the seriousness of the situation.

The last point I would like to submit is this. The Minister in his statement has said, we will have bilateral discussions with USA. We want to be assured by the Minister that it will be a natural corollary and after that we will not enter into or be pushed into that so-called five nations talks on this. Sir, it has come to be known and perhaps the whole world knows it that we have been persuaded not to go in for a second exercise on *Agni* which was a proud achievement of this country. Our nation was proud of it. We know with certainty that we have been persuaded not to go in for that exercise. We would like to know what it really means.

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I thank hon. Mr. Chaturvedi for really raising a question of impropriety in all that happened in connection with this. It has been stated here that our Foreign Secretary was at a regular meeting with various U.S. officials. We remember the news splashed out in all national newspapers about one or one-and-a-half months back with the heading "U.S Summons Indian and Pak Foreign Secretaries." Pak Foreign Secretary made a visit earlier. Our Foreign Secretary made a visit later. But I don't know whether the Foreign Secretary of our country is authorised or entitled to make statements like a plenipotentiary on all and sundry matters at a routine meeting with a foreign country. That is exactly what our Foreign

Secretary did and this is a document just to justify whatever the Foreign Secretary did.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please, seek your clarifications.

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA: Yes, Sir. This is also a part of the clarifications.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): That is your views.

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA: You will see whether this perception of mine is correct or not. Secondly, you have NPT and other things. There are certain other things into which I am not going. But it is a sort of syllogism-NPT, non-proliferation, five-power treaty. What is our position, according to the Prime Minister? What is our position according to the External Affairs Minister, according to the Minister of State for External Affairs and according to the Foreign Secretary? There is a strange situation. I should say regarding the Pentagon papers many things have been read out. What has been said regarding these papers in the newspapers reports in the *Washington Post*—has been quoted here. I didn't see the *Washington Post*. It was prepared in conjunction with the National Security Council which is under the U.S. President direct, which advises the President on national security matters. It was prepared in conjunction with the National Security Council and in consultation either with President Bush or his senior advisers. There are three parts. One is threatening India like anything and our Foreign Secretary from Washington was constantly trying to underplay this document. On what basis, nobody knows. His responsibility was to ascertain the real basis and inform the Government of it and let the Government take a decision. What the Foreign Secretary did was the height of impropriety and it was none of his business. He definitely exceeded his brief and put the country to ridicule. Regarding joint naval exercise, in this Session my specific question was whatever India has developed strategic alliance with the U.S. defence department. What has been stated here is that we have defence arrangements with many friendly countries and among them there is U.S. joint naval exercise is not training. One thing has not been said. We wanted....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please conclude.

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA:... the Indian Ocean to be a zone of peace, free of superpower presence when there were two superpowers. Now, there is only one superpower. Would you like that superpower to be on our coastal line and on the Indian Ocean as a whole?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please conclude now.

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA: Let our stand be explained by the Minister and we ought to know that. The Minister read out his statement very rapidly in keeping with the rapid changes in the policy of the Indian Government.

6.00 P.M.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Dr. Narreddy Thulsai Reddy. Please confine yourself to two or three minutes.

DR. NARREDDY THULASI REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I put my first clarification. There is a proverb in Telugu, "Nippu lenide Poga radu" which means, no smoke without fire. Sir, this Pentagon paper is nothing but smoke. There is real fire. In the near future we will see fire. Sir, this Pentagon paper is very alarming. It is sending dangerous signals to us. It clearly shows the attitude and thinking of the USA towards India. Sir, what is written in the Pentagon paper? "We should discourage the Indian hegemonic aspirations over the other States in South Asia and on the Indian Ocean. With regard to Pakistan, a constructive USA-Pakistan military relationship will be an important element in our strategy to promote stable security conditions in South West Asia and Central Asia." After reading these sentences, I strongly feel that this Government has so far misled the Parliament and the country regarding

Indo-US relationship and US-Pak relationship. So, I want this point to be clarified.

Sir, again there is a proverb in Telugu: "Viyyanikina kayyanikina samavujjeelu vundalu."

It means, there should be equal partners either for enmity or for friendship. What are we doing here? Efforts are going on for mutual relationship, mutual cooperation in defence services between India and the USA. It is very dangerous to our security. It is nothing but suicidal to our security because the USA will penetrate into our strategic installations which will be dangerous to our country. So, I want the Government to rethink over this issue.

I want to know from the Government, whether granting over-flight rights to the USA not only for transportation but also for war planes was discussed or not. If it was discussed, what was the stand of our Government?

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुरः— श्रीमन्, बहुत-सी बातें कही जा चुकी हैं, लेकिन मैं दो-तीन बातें प्रमुख रूप से पूछूंगा।

प्रथम तो यह कि जो पेंटागन पेपर लीक हुआ है, यह लिखा कब गया था? क्या हमारे मंत्री महोदय ने या हमारे सचिव ने यह जानने की कोशिश की कि लीक तो आज हुआ है, लेकिन लिखा कब गया था? यह प्रमुख बात है। यदि यह रूस के टूटने से पहले लिखा गया था तो शायद उसकी एक अलग भूमिका हो सकती थी लेकिन यदि अभी लिखा गया है तो इसकी भूमिका बिल्कुल अलग है क्योंकि रूस के टूटने से पहले यदि पाकिस्तान को हमारे साथ लगभग बराबरी के दर्जे में रखते तो हमारी समझ में आता था। यह अमेरिका की नीति रही है, लेकिन रूस के टूटने के बाद अगर पेपर लिखा गया है तो मुझे संदेह यह है कि यह नीतिपूर्वक लीक किया गया है। यह कोई वहां के स्वतंत्र समाचार पत्रों की देन नहीं है। यह सरकार का या पेंटागन का खेल है कि इसको लीक किया जाय जिससे कि हिंदुस्तान की हैसियत क्या है, यह दुनिया के सामने रख दें। उसके साथ-ही-साथ हिंदुस्तान की सरकार और हिंदुस्तान की पार्लियामेंट को भी एक प्रकार से अखाड़े के अंदर खड़ा कर दिया जाय।

तो उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा पहला सवाल यह है कि क्या हमारे सचिव महोदय ने यह जानने की कोशिश की कि पेंटागन पेपर वास्तव में लिखा कब गया था और क्या यह वास्तव में लीक हुआ या जानबूझकर खेली गयी नीति का एक हिस्सा है? दूसरे, यह कहा गया है कि हम भारत की "हेगमोनी" को डिस्करेज करेंगे। क्या हमारे सचिव ने यह जानने की कोशिश की कि हमारी "हेगमोनी है क्या और कैसे डिस्करेज करेंगे?

भारत की कोई हिगेमॅनि नहीं है बल्कि अगर देखें तो दूसरे लोग हमारे ऊपर छा रहे हैं। बंगला देश से रिफ्यूजी आए, हम कुछ नहीं कर सकते, पाकिस्तान इनफिल्ट्रेशन कर रहा है, हम कुछ नहीं कर सकते, लंका के लोग हमारे यहां आ कर हमारे भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री को मार जाते हैं, हम कुछ नहीं कर सकते। हिगेमॅनि-एक दबाव है तो उनका है, हमारा दबाव नहीं है। हम तो आसपास के लोगों से दबे हुए हैं - चीन ने हमारी जमीन दबा रखी है, बर्मा से हमारे यहां लोग घुसे चले आ रहे हैं, हमारे भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री मारे जा रहे हैं। हमारी हिगेमॅनि क्या है? मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि क्या हमारे सचिव ने यह पूछने की कोशिश की या जब यह वाक्य इस्तेमाल किया जाता है तो हमारा विदेश मंत्रालय उनके हिगेमॅनि के आरोप को किस माने में लेता है? दूसरे यह कहा कि पाकिस्तान के साथ उनके रिश्ते मिलिट्री के बने रहेंगे। क्या अर्थ है इसका? इन दो वाक्यों के बीच में हमारा मंत्रालय क्या करता है? उनकी इन दो बातों के बीच में से नीति कौन सी निकलती है? मुझे संदेह यह है कि हमें यह कन्वे किया गया है कि अगर आप किसी विषय पर, चाहे कश्मीर का ही विषय हो, यदि आपके और पाकिस्तान के बीच में तनाव पैदा हो गया तो हम पाकिस्तान के साथ खड़े रहेंगे। तो मैं आपसे यह पूछना चाहूंगा कि हमारा विदेश मंत्रालय इसको कश्मीर की पृष्ठभूमि में किस दृष्टि से देखता है? इसके साथ ही संबंधित है कि यहां पर श्री प्रैसलर आए थे कुछ महीने पहले, यहां कहकर गए, उन्होंने स्वीकार किया कि दुनिया में इस्लामिक फंडामेंटालिज्म बढ़ रहा है। क्या उन्होंने इस पृष्ठभूमि में यह जानने की कोशिश की कि क्या प्रैसलर ने जो कहा था - प्रैसलर मामूली आदमी नहीं है, वह अमरीका का एक विशेष व्यक्ति है, तो क्या प्रैसलर का यह कहना है कि दुनिया में इस्लामिक फंडामेंटलिज्म बढ़ रहा है और यह भी उनको बुद्धि तब आई जब रूस टूट गया। इस्लामिक फंडामेंटलिज्म केवल 1991-92 में ही बढ़ा, जब कि रूस टूट गया? उससे पहले भी होगा। तो इस पृष्ठभूमि का स्पष्टीकरण मैं चाहता हूं कि इस पर हमारा विदेश मंत्रालय क्या कहना चाहता है, क्या उसकी नीति है और क्या इस विषय में वह सजग है और क्या हमारे सचिव ने इस बात को पूछा है कि प्रैसलर ने यह कहा है, आपके पेंटागन का यह कहना है, आपका पाकिस्तान के बारे में यह कहना

है? हमारा कहना क्या है, इसके बारे में स्पष्टीकरण करना चाहिए?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Mr. Mathur, your time is over.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर: औरों को आप 15 मिनट दे रहे हैं और मेरा टाइम काटा जा रहा है।

स्वर्गीय राजीव गांधी के संदर्भ में इसमें कहा गया है कि:—

Threshold States would undertake obligations not to cross the threshold.

हिन्दुस्तान थ्रेशोल्ड में कहा जा सकता है, हमने आणविक शस्त्र बनाया नहीं है, लेकिन हमारी बनाने की क्षमता है, यह बात ठीक है। पाकिस्तान कहां खड़ा है? पाकिस्तान बना चुका है या नहीं बना चुका है? मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि जब इन्होंने यह क्वोट किया है तो पाकिस्तान को इस मामले में कहां खड़ा करते हैं? प्रैसलर के अमेंडमेंट के विषय में राष्ट्रपति बुश ने अपना इसमें समर्थन नहीं किया है, बात सच है लेकिन यह भी नहीं कहा है कि बना लिया है। तो मैं पूछना चाहूंगा कि हमारे जो भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री का वक्तव्य है और मैं समझता हूं कि राजीव गांधी के वक्तव्य से आज की सरकार बंधी हुई है क्योंकि उन्होंने उसको क्वोट किया है, तो पाकिस्तान को हमारे खिलाफ कहां खड़ा करते हैं? क्या वे पाकिस्तान को भी थ्रेशोल्ड कंट्री मानते हैं? यदि नहीं मानते हैं तो साफ तौर से हमारे सचिव ने क्यों नहीं कहा कि उसको भी एक आणविक पावर माना जाए व उसके ऊपर बंधन लगाये जाएं कि वह एन०पी०टी० पर हस्ताक्षर करे?

दूसरे, मैं वही सवाल रिपीट करूंगा जो मेरे साथियों ने रिपीट किया है 5 देशों की कांफ्रेंस, आपने कहा है कि हिगेमैनि होगी, आपने मना क्यों नहीं किया कि हम किसी कांफ्रेंस में शामिल होने को तैयार नहीं हैं? रेड्डी साहब की बात से मैं सहमत नहीं हूं, उन्होंने कहा कि 5 के अलावा 6-7 को और बुला लो। क्यों बुला लो? हमने एटम बनाया नहीं है, मेरी पार्टी कहती है एटम बनाना चाहिए, लेकिन आज की सरकार कहती है कि एटम नहीं बनाएंगें। तो उन्हें यह साफ कहने में क्या दिक्कत है कि हम किसी भी कांफ्रेंस में शामिल नहीं होंगे? मैं इस बारे में कैटागॉरिकल जवाब चाहता हूं कि इस विषय में नीति क्या है?

अंतिम बात 301 के बारे में है। इसमें कहा गया है कि ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री सुब्रह्मण्यम स्वामी: स्पेशल या सुपर?

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर: सुपर है।

"Honourable Members are aware that the Special 301 investigation against India on the issue of intellectual property rights has been terminated."

क्यों टर्मिनेट की गयी, मुझे बतायें? क्या हमने कुछ अंडरस्टैंडिंग दी है, जिसके कारण टर्मिनेट की गयी है? लेकिन उसका तो राइडर है। राइडर क्या है?

"The United States Trade Representative had, however, announced on 26 February, 1992 that an Inter-Agency Committee will be mandated to develop options for possible implementation and action if the facts so warrant."

मतलब क्या है? आपने नाक यों न पकड़ी, यों पकड़ली। तो दोनों बातों का कहीं कोई मेल है? आपका वक्तव्य इतना अन्तर्विरोधी है कि एक तरफ कहते हैं कि टर्मिनेट कर दिया है और दूसरी तरफ कहते हैं कि इंटर एजेंसी कमैटी बैठेगी और अगर आवश्यकता हुई तो करेंगे। तो मैं चाहता हूं कि इस पर साफ-साफ बतायें कि उन्होंने क्या कोई कमिटमेंट किया है या नहीं किया है?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Mr. Sukomal Sen. Please be very brief.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): I will certainly try to be very brief, but the statement is very long. And it concerns the sovereignty of the whole country. The point some honourable Members including Members from the Treasury Benches raised is whether the Foreign Minister could come out with a statement on his Foreign Secretary's visit and his actions, words and deeds. Without going into the protocol of the matter I would like to make a comment that this action of the honourable Minister that he comes out with a *suo motu* statement on the Foreign Secretary's visit or his words exhibits a basic conflicting situation prevailing in the Foreign Ministry. They are yet to make up their policy. They are vacillating and they don't know what to do and what to say. That is why this imbalance in the their foreign policy. We have been charging the Government that the Government is surrendering to the United States not only in military affairs but in foreign affairs as well as economic affairs. Though the Government tries to make a feeble defence of its military policy or foreign policy or economic policy, the fact remains that the

Government is buckling down under the U.S. pressure and this is a result of the collapse of the Soviet Union. And that is why the Government is kneeling before the U.S. I would like to know from the honourable Minister whether, when they sent the Foreign Secretary the U.S. for having negotiations, they prepared a brief which was to be followed by the Foreign Secretary during his visit to the United States and whether the Foreign Secretary has acted within the brief or whether he has violated the brief. He has expressed concern about the Pentagon papers, about the so-called Pentagon papers. What are the Pentagon papers? Whether it is middle level or high level, Pentagon is an official body. These papers are official on which the U.S. Government will have to act. Whether they accept all the points made in the paper or reject all the points or accept some of them, is a different thing. An official body has prepared certain papers in Pentagon. And all of us know what Pentagon is, the character of Pentagon. I need not describe that. What have they said; "Hegemonic aspirations of India"...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): You need not read. Just make you points.

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN:.... "India's nuclear facilities should come under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards."

"Use force to dismantle nuclear installations, etc."

India is not Iraq. The same words were used and are being used by the United States against Iraq while they bombarded the country. The same humiliating words the Pentagon papers have used against India. And now what has our Foreign Secretary done? He has expressed his serious concern. The Minister should have directed the Foreign Secretary to condemn these Pentagon papers outright. But he has expressed his serious concern. The big boss kicking his subordinate and the subordinate just expressing his concern with the big boss! This is cringing and this should not be the attitude of the Government of India. The Indian Government should have told the U.S. Government that it was outright condemning the Pentagon papers.

And, Sir, the views of the Government should be clear that the Pentagon Paper should be treated as null and void and treated as withdrawn. But they have not done so.

Now, I would like to say something about the Naval exercise. What is the exercise for? You see how the Government is making a weak defence saying that it is useful, professionally useful, for our Navy. So far there was no joint Naval exercise with the US. This is the first time that they are doing it. Should I conclude from the honourable Minister's statement that our Naval officers are professionally less efficient and only these exercises will make them more useful and efficient? Should I conclude that having a joint Naval exercise with their Navy means that they are quite efficient and useful? What are the exercises for? Sir, this is happening in the new international context. If only means that they are going to surrender to the United States, that they are going to surrender to their bullying. One of the honourable Members here raised the issue about the Korean ship on the Indian Ocean and various things are said about it. But they have not said anything at all about it. What is the attitude of the Government to it?

Then, Sir, what about the NPT? This does not say anything about it. There is a difference between the NPT and non-proliferation in general. For discussing the nuclear non-proliferation, the suitable body, the proper place, is the Security Council and the Prime Minister made a statement in the Security Council that the time-frame should be advanced to the year 2000 AD. But the statement of the Minister is silent on this aspect. This has to be done. Then, Sir, the statement is silent also on the reported news item that the Foregin Secretary has agreed to the US suggestion for bilateral talks between the US and the Indian Governments and that the level, date and venue of the discussion will be decided later on.

First of all, I would like to know what the stand of the Government on the NPT

is. Is it negotiable now? Is it negotiable at all? It is not. Then why has our Foreign Secretary said the bilateral discussions between the US and India would be held and that the date and venue and the level of discussion will be worked out later? It is not nuclear non-proliferation or nuclear disarmament, but it is the NPT. But this issue has been raised by the Foreign Secretary and yet the Minister has not said anything about it.

My last point is about the Special 301. My point is that it should be linked with the Dunkel proposals. Repeatedly, in Parliament and elsewhere, we have discussed this and said that before joining the negotiations, the Government should take a consistent stand, should take the consensus view of Parliament, on the Dunkel proposals and also the views of the different political parties. Has the Government decided something about it, decided that before they join the next round of discussions, they will consult Parliament? I am asking this question because we do not want that the Indian Government surrenders and to stop that surrender, it is necessary that they should come to Parliament before they go there.

Sir, I would like to have clarifications on all these points. I do not know what the Minister has to say. He will put up some weak defence. I only hope that he will not put up a weak defence, but a bolder one. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Now, Mr. Anand Prakash Gautam.

श्री आनन्द प्रकाश गौतम (उत्तर प्रदेश): महोदय, कुछ प्रश्नों का उत्तर माननीय मंत्री जी से चाहता हूं। मैं राग्राफ 11 के संबंध में माननीय मंत्री जी से स्पष्टीकरण ाहूंगा। इसमें कहा गया है - कई मित्र देशों के साथ क्षा के क्षेत्र में भारत का सहयोग है जिनमें संयुक्त राष्ट्र मरीका भी शामिल है। यह बात ऐसी लगती है जैसे मने कभी अपने हित में सारी दुनिया की बात की है। ार आगे कहा गया है - इसमें कई मित्र देशों का साथ । तो यह मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि वह कौन-कौन से देश जिनके साथ इस तरह का हमारा सहयोग है। सहयोग ी बात भी है। दूसरा यदि सहयोग की बात होती है, हयोग का प्रस्ताव हमने किया था या किसी के सहयोग ा प्रस्ताव हमने स्वीकार किया है, इससे यह पता चले ा सहयोग हुआ है। यह सहयोग हमारा कब से जारी है? इस बात से भी कुछ पता चल सकता है कि कितने देशों से हम सहयोग इस प्रकार का कर रहे हैं? उससे हमको क्या लाभ मिले हैं या मिलने वाले हैं?

अंत में कहा गया है, बड़ी शान से कहा गया है कि हमने किसी भी करार पर हस्ताक्षर नहीं किए हैं। इसका मतलब ऐसा लगता है कि जैसे हमने बड़ी चतुराई से कोई एग्रीमेंट पर सिगनेचर न करके प्रतिबंध से अपने को बाहर रखा है। लेकिन हो सकता है कि ताकतवर ने आपके हस्ताक्षर करने की आवश्यकता न समझी हो। अगर वह एग्रीमेंट कोडीफाइड होता तो उसका लाभ हमको मिल सकता था। तो मैं यह स्पष्टीकरण माननीय मंत्री जी से चाहूंगा कि हिंद महासागर को इस तरह से अभ्यास का स्थल बनाना हमारे देश के लिए किस प्रकार से लाभकारी होगा? धन्यवाद।

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful that you have given me time... (*Interruptions*)

Sir, we are all aware that in the post-cold war situation there has been a slight difference in the actions of the United States and in the words which they have been using. The words which they use are the same as they used to use-many of the words-which they used during the pre-cold war period: "These are our allies, this is the way we can help them, and this is the way we go to crush our enemies". But their action as have been different. Their actions *vis-a-vis* India have been different. We have been constantly threatened, and I say this with some knowledge. We have been constantly threatened with action under 301. But no action has ever been taken. Nothing. Even though we have been told, "you are on the List, this is going to happen, that is going to happen", such statements are made but privately we are told, "you don't have to worry, nothing is going to happen". And nothing has happened till today. Not one threat have they actually implemented even *vis-a-vis* Pakistan. If there is one arm of the United States which says, "we are going to aid Pakistan", there is another arm which makes sure that no aid is forthcoming to Pakistan. There are various methods by which they make sure that aid to Pakistan is curtailed or over a period of time stopped. These are the lobbies which are working in the United States for the interest of our country, for the interest of India. That is why it is all the more

surprising, in the context of these things and in the context of the Foreign Secretary's visit, who has had ministerial level consultations...

AN HON. MEMBER: More than that.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Thank you. More than that. He has had consultations at very important levels. It shows the importance with which India is viewed in the United States. It reiterates what I have been saying. And Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in this context, these Pentagon papers acquire a serious dimension at one level, because if they are at some autoritative level, if they have not been denied by the U.S. Government, if they are a part of their policy planning process, then there is cause for some alarm.

On the other hand, as we are all aware—I would like to ask the Minister my first clarification—is it not a fact that in our system of governance, in our system of formulation of policies, we take various views into consideration, purely for academic discussion? Purely for academic discussion, we take various opposing views into consideration. And where our final policy is formulated, that is our policy which rejects many of those views. Is it not a fact that we do that in this country also? And could this exercise be not a part of a similar exercise taking place in the United States? Therefore, I would like to ask as my second clarification from the hon. Minister, at what level was this Pentagon Paper—exact level—if he could kindly know. And has this been denied by the US Government? A private conversational denial is different. But at what level was the Foreign Secretary assured that these proposals, these Pentagon Papers are not authentic, that they do not reflect the US policy? And, I think, as far as I know, my memory may fault me, but I do believe there was some official denial also.

SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH (BIHAR): Official confirmation.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: No, no. At one level, there was official confirmation, and there was denial also.

SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH: No denial.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Let him complete.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: I may be mistaken.

SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH: We are correcting you. What is wrong in correcting you?

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: I would like my good friend, Mr. Digvijay Singh wait for the Minister to correct me rather than jump and correct me immediately.

SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH: I am not jumping.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: You are not jumping; you are jumping the gun.

SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH: It is a friendly advice.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: I take your advice in the same manner of friendliness in which it is extended, exactly the same manner.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Any other clarification?

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Yes, Sir. I have two or three very minor points to make, rather major points to make in a minor manner, in a very short form.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: He is not seeking, he is offering clarifications.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: No, no. I am seeking clarification. I have not given any answers. I am not asking him: Do we have a policy to do that? Are we doing that?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): Please do not repeat.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Secondly, Sir, on NPT, I would earnestly request the hon. Minister, let us not stay away from any fora where we can make our voice heard. Our tragedy has always been that we turn our backs and we say, 'we do not want to talk about that, we do not want to talk about this.' That is a sign of weakness. We are a strong nation. We are a nation which is looked up to by everybody in the region. Even the Pentagon...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: We do not agree with you.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: You may not agree.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: This is not the Party's view.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: This is my personal view.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): It is not the Party's view. He is giving his personal view.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: This is not the Party's view. This is my personal view. (*Interruption*) I very much accept that Smt. Jayanthi Natarajan is the substitute for Mr. C.P. Thakur, and she has stated the Party view-point. But my view is that we should not stay away from any fora where we can make our voice heard, where we can put forward our view-points. My last point, Sir, last but one...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Yashwant should have been the last...

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: You want to disturb me?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: Not at all.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: I see that the Leader of the Opposition is giving very sound advice to his colleague.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: No, no. I was advising him not to disturb you.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: I thought you were asking him to disturb me. I am mistaken. I stand corrected.

As regards surveillance, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I want to take exactly two minutes of the House extra to be able to make the point, if you permit me. The first official present which was given to Chairman Mao by the U.S. Administration when the first contact was made between the U.S. and China was the photograph of Chairman Mao cutting roses in his garden. Chairman Mao asked: "What is the use of this photograph? Why do you present it to me?" He was told that the photograph had been taken by a satellite miles above the earth. And that, Sir, is the status of surveillance even today. If we talk of surveillance, we must remember that it has reached a highly technical level with satellites all over the world and computers analysing those pictures. A few ships coming here or the men physically verifying in India does not mean anything. Surveillance is from the skies today. You cannot stop surveillance no matter how you try; just like you cannot stop those television waves coming no matter what you try.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: That can be tried.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: You can make an effort. Lastly, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the issue of Kashmir was discussed. The statement is completely silent on the issue of Kashmir. I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether Kashmir was discussed, whether the role of the U.S. in the supply of arms to Mujahideens on the borders of Afganistan, and those arms being diverted, and the issue of Mujahideens now being active in Kashmir, was discussed by the Foreign Secretary, and if so, what was the result of it; what was their attitude and their reply. Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I want to place on record that many of us disagree with what Mr. Singh said about India joining the talks on NPT. We should not join the talks. There is no question of attending it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): He is giving his views.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: But I want to place on record my opinion.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: The cold war seems to have disappeared from the world but still alive and well in Rajya Sabha. It is quite clear listening to some of the interventions and clarifications today.

Sir, the issue is one of great seriousness that we are getting into the habit of denigrating the civil servants in Parliament. I have been a Minister and I know that our civil servants loyally execute what the political authorities decide and, therefore, if there has been anything that is out of order, the obvious people to be targeted are the Ministers, not the civil servants. For example, I would like to refer to so-called Pentagon

Papers and about which there is so much outrage here today. Why should we take these papers seriously? The Indian Institute of Defence Studies and Analysis which is headed by the Foreign Minister produces lots of papers in which all kinds of things are said. Of course, nobody in the world takes notice of it. But that does not mean that whatever is written there is the Government policy. In the U.S., these kinds of position papers for discussion are produced practically in every institution and, in fact, one stress is that they debate the issues very thoroughly, outrageous views are expressed; all kinds of views are expressed, and ultimately something is filtered out and it becomes part of policy. There is widest possible consultation that takes place in the U.S. before a policy is formulated and I think there is something to be learnt from them by us. That is, we should also have think-tanks in various parts of the Government which produce papers, and ultimately a policy formulated. It is in that context I would say that because the Chief of Army Staff used the word 'bandicoot' against some country, there is objection. I do not know where the interview took place. Judging the Pioneer and its editor's past record, I would say it might have taken place in an army mess over a drink, and that is common language.

This is common language in an Army mess, to call somebody '*bandicoot*'. I think if our Army people have disregard for the enemy, which, after all, they have to have, I do not think we should drag him in here and denigrate him. I think, the obvious thing to do in such a case, if you feel embarrassed, is to tell him privately. I do not think Parliament ought to be debating this issue.

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA: This was in the newspapers. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: What I am saying is that, generally, officials' conduct should not be brought in this way.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: You seek clarifications.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: I am following your pattern of giving a long-winding background and then seeking clarifications. Nothing new.

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI: Are you his follower?

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: No follower.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY: I have been his follower.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY: What we should really look at is, what has been discussed. Unfortunately, from the statement, I find that the agenda for discussions between the Foreign Secretary and the authorities in the U.S. had been drawn up by the U.S. None of the issues which were of direct concern to us were on the agenda. Terrorism, for example. There does not seem to be any concrete aspects discussed, in regard to terrorism.Similarly, the question of Islamic fundamentalism which is an issue on our agenda, or, for that matter, the U.S. support for Hindu and Sikh fundamentalism, which has now begun to increase. These are matters of some concern even to people like Mr. Jagdish Prasad Mathur. These are the issues. The reason why this is so is because, we have not formulated a foreign policy in the new context.

We have not formulated a foreign policy in the new context. There has been no discussion. What happened to our policy of non-alignment? Is it still in place? What is our new attitude? All of a sudden, in the statement, the U.S.A. has been described as a friendly country. Since when? When was that decision taken? I would like to know from the Government, in view of what has happened and the confusion that has been caused, whether there is any proposal to have a threadbare discussion on our foreign policy, and whether the Government is prepared to make a statement on the floor of Parliament on the parameters of that policy.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATARAMAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice- Chairman, Sir, I have two-three questions. My first question is, in paragraph 2, it is said...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): You need not read it.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G.

VENKATARAMAN: If I have to put my questions, without referring to the statement, they would not be relevant.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): The Minister has read the statement.

SHRI TINDIVANAM G. VENKATARAMAN: I have to substantiate my point. I cannot read the way the Minister read the statement. I have to point out and criticise. Only when I refer to the statement, I can put questions.

Firstly, in paragraph 2, the statement says: "Foreign Secretary visited Washington, March 9-11, for talks on matters of mutual interest." "Matters of mutual interest" mean matters between India and the U.S.A., or, matters relating to India and Pakistan? This is my first question. it is very vague here. This is a bold statement.

Secondly, who gave the agenda to the Foreign Secretary to go and discuss there all these matters? What was the agenda? In this context, was the Pentagon paper in the possession of the Government before the Foreign Secretary went there and discussed this matter? Or, did he come to know only when he went there and, therefore, a surprise to him?

Thirdly, the statement quotes extracts from the Pentagon paper—which appeared in the U.S. Press—in paragraph 4. it says: "In this regard, we should work to have both countries, India and Pakistan, adhere to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and to place their nuclear energy facilities under International Atomic Energy safeguards." In the later part, it says: "With regard to Pakistan, a constructive US-Pakistani military relationship will be an important element in our strategy to promote stable security conditions in South-West Asia and Central Asia." What does it mean? The U.S. position has been explicitly stated here. Are we a party to this?

These are the three questions which I would like the hon. Minister to answer.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, may I at the outset thank hon. Members, Sarvashri Yashwant Sinha, Kapil Verma, Jaipal Reddy, A.G. Kulkarni, Bhuvnesh Chaturvedi, Prof. Bhattacharya, Dr. Reddy, J.P. Mathur, Gautam, V.P. Singh, Dr. Swamy and Venkatraman, for their...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): And not all those who are sitting?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Yes, all those who are sitting here in spite of the late hour. They who remain silent also contribute. I must thank them for their very perspective remarks and questions.

May I first deal with the question of so-called Pentagon Paper? I need not mention what I have already said here but it needs reiteration that this paper does not reflect the position of the U.S. on various issues dealt with and it is subject to further review. The paper itself we do not have. We have got only the reports. And what is important, as Dr. Swamy and Mr. Vishvjit Singh said, that these papers; they are there in the U.S. as they are in India and many papers do come up like that. I would, however, like to point out a few things in this regard. Firstly, that the United States official spokesman himself has described this report as, and I quote, "Myopic and shallow and it is not the Government's policy." So, the paper is myopic in the view of the United States official spokesman, it is shallow and it is not the Government's policy.

SHRI VISHVJIT P. SINGH: Is this what the U.S. spokesman has said?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Yes, the spokesman has said that. In spite of that, this is what we understand from the reports in the newspapers 'The New York Times', 'Washington Times' and so on. Secondly, we are on a very elementary or preliminary stage of one of the many papers—as has been rightly pointed out by Dr. Swamy—which go to formulate the policy. We are at a point where, forget about the President or the Defence Secretary, even for that matter their deputies have not really vetted the paper. This is the stage on which we are and this is the reaction right now of the official spokesman of the United States. *(Interruption)*.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA (Bihar): Are we talking about press reports?

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR : Do you have the idea when this paper was prepared?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : As I have mentioned, we do not have the paper, we have seen the press reports recently. (*Interruptions*). In spite of the point the I have made, I would like to mention that we had taken up this matter at the time of the visit of the Foreign Secretary with them, with the officials he met, and they were quite senior officials. We have pointed out to those officials that the report or the so-called Paper, in the manner in which we have seen it in the newspaper, is unacceptable and objectionable to us and that it will affect Indo-US relations negatively.

Now I would like to respond to some of the other points raised by hon. Members. A very perceptive point was raised by Mr. Sinha and others about the Pressler Amendment, whether the Government of the United States was keen on enforcing this and the answer that we got was, yes, the Amendment would continue and it would be enforced in that spirit, in the spirit in which it is expected to be enforced.

Also in view of these reports and other reports that have come, we have naturally taken up the question of the U.S.-Pakistani connection and we were told that it is a military factor which is there, but whetever the military factor, the relationship of U.S. with Pakistan would not be to the detriment of the Indian interest.

SHRI JADGISH PRASAD MATHUR : But for decades you have seen the record. The record is reverse.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR) : But that is the perception of the Government. Let him complete.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : There is a contradiction in the posion taken by the Minister. The Minister just now stated that the Pressler Amendment would continue to be effective against Pakistan. At the same time, in the same breath the Minister has added that the military relations of the U.S. with Pakistan will continue without affecting our position. The Pressler Amendment is there in the context of the military relationship of the U.S. with Pakistan. How do you reconcile these two positions?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : Those two positions must be read together, interpreted together, Sir. The military angle has been so diluted by the Pressler Amendment, and even this diluted military angle in the US-Pakistan relationship will not be to the detriment of Indian interests. That is what we are assured, and that is how the position stands.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR : Is the Government satisfied with the assurance?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR) : Let him complete.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : Hon. Members must understand that the Pressler Amendment is basically directed against the government's sales of arms or the government's contribution of arms of Pakistan. If there are private arms sales, it is not specifically covered by the Pressler Amendment. That is one interpretation that is going around in Washington. Even on the question of private sales, the Administration has pointed out that it will use all its power, all its influence to see that Indian interests are not affected.

Sir, I would like to say about the naval exercise that there is nothing new about this exercise as naval exercises have been conducted with other countries also. Hon. Members wanted to know with which countries and when. I would like to say, Sir, joint naval exercises were conducted with Indonesia in September 1989, again with Indonesia on March 2, 1991, with Australia from October 30 to November 1, 1991. It is not a question with the United States....

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI : I specifically asked about the USSR.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : We have not conducted with the USSR.

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI : Then you tell it.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : We have not conducted with the USSR. (*Interruptions*) There is no USSR left.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR) : Please, let him deal with it.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : The point I am making here is that it is not that the United States has been singled out for any such exercise. These exercises are being carried out with other countries also, will perhaps be carried out....

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA: For what purpose?

SHRI MD. SALIM (West Bengal) : For this friendly exercise, who is the enemy?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : No enemy. This is the point.

SHRI MD. SALIM : A joint exercise is done against some common enemy. Who is the common enemy against whom you are exercising along with the U.S.?

SHRI BHUVNESH CHATURVEDI : This is between enemies themselves.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : The point is well taken, and I must clarify that these military exercises are not directed against anybody. These military exercises are for upgrading our own technology in its different aspects. We find, rather the Defence Ministry finds them useful. It is open to the Defence Ministry to have this exercise with the United States and to have it with such countries as they would like.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : One point I would like to say that if the Minister thinks that having a naval exercise with Indonesia or Australia is at par with having a naval exercise with the USA, then, he is welcome to have his perception.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : On the point which has been made whether the exercise will be near the coast or off the coast, I may say here for record that the exercise will be off the coast of India and not in the coastal water.

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA : Is there an agreement to that effect? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : We have not been able to understand it, Sir. What is the difference? *(Interruptions)*

We are here seeking clarifications.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA : We have the right to seek clarifications. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR) : Mr. Minister, please continue.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : On the Super Special 301 our position has been...

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : What is the difference between coastal waters and off the coast? I am in all innocence seeking a clarification. I have not been able to follow the difference between the two.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : You know it as well as anybody else who understands the dictionary. You must have read it. Coast is coastal waters, and away from the coast is high seas, as much away as you perhaps would like provided the Defence Ministry. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : The National Front Government allowed the USA planes to fly over India. ...*(Interruptions)*

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA : On what basis has this statement been made that it would not be near the coast but off the coast? Is there any agreement?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : In the context of Super 301 and also in the context of special 301, I would like to say that there was no compromise of any sort. Our interests will not be compromised as far as Super 301 is concerned, as far as 301 is concerned. May I say this very firmly that equations in the world might have changed, global situations might have changed, but there is one thing that remains unchanged and that is that the Government of India, that this Government will at all point of time safegrard national interests, will not bend, will not sacrifice and will remain committed to advancement of national interests. There is no question of confrontation, but there is firmness all the way and there is no compromise as far as national interests of this country go. That applies to 301 and that applies to all the issues.

SHRI SUMBRAMANIAN SWAMY : Mr. Minister, would you yield?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR) : He has completed.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY : No, Sir. He has yielded. What the Minister seems to be saying, if I understood him correctly, is that everything may change, but our Government will not change. Is that what he is saying?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO : Our policy of commitment to national interest surely will not change; our firmness will not change; our attitude will not be an attitude of confrontation, but undoubtedly it will be a firm attitude without any whitewashing or dilly-dallying on what we believe and perceive and how to perceive the interests of the country.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Sir, you have not stated your position in regard to the five-nation conference. Would you like to make a reference to that?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: On five-power conference, I would like to tell this to the House. We have the five-power conference on nuclear free zone concept as moved by Pakistan at the United Nations. We have Mr. Nawaz Sharif's proposal. I may say we have rejected these proposals. We don't see a point in them. As for what the United States has come with — and as it is mentioned as a five-nation conference — we have not yet got the slightest idea. Nor have we been put in the picture. We don't know what the United States means by this five-power conference and what these five powers are going to do. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: Do you mean to say that you don't know what is happening about it? But you have not rejected it. We want a categorical answer whether you have rejected the five-nation conference or not.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: We have said and we will say it again that when it comes to weapons of mass destruction and when it particularly comes to nuclear weapons, whose reach is global, the solution also must be global. The solution has to be global and the solution has to be non-discriminatory.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: We want your answer in 'yes' or 'no'. Our question is whether the five-nation conference has been rejected or not.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I have said a five-nation conference will not solve the problems.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: That means still they have not got the idea.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I have made it extremely clear and anybody will understand. Mr. Mathur will understand it better than most others. We are making it clear that if we are discussing in a five-nation conference nuclear non-proliferation in a particular region then the question arises why this conference concept is not valid. How and why only five nations? Will only five nations pose a threat? That is the thing that militates against the five nations. Then comes the question of principle. What exactly do you mean by five-nation conference? With all these things in our mind, our approach is nuclear weapons non-proliferation. We are for non-proliferation of nuclear weapons all over the world, globally. A regional solution is no solution.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR: But, why did you agree to bilateral talks with US?

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Bilateral talks we are for with USA and with anybody which the hon. Member may like to suggest. We are against the NPT on principle for the reason the House is aware, such as discrimination and other reasons and non-solution of the problem. We are for non-proliferation and solution to non-proliferation level bilaterally or at any level, which is non-proliferation globally, we are prepared to accept.

PROF. SAURIN BHATTACHARYA: You must have sought explanation regarding the five-power conference.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I have already mentioned about this. I would mention, however, that India and this Government and all successive Governments have been and are committed to non-proliferation. We are committed to non- proliferation on global basis and non-discriminator basis. We

have a plan of action that was laid before the third Disarmament Session of the United Nations by the late Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi. That is a detailed plan. It provides for global nuclear disarmament and destruction of weapons of mass destruction by the year 2010.

This was formulated and laid before the United Nations when the cold war was on its last legs but still around. Now that the cold war is no more, the Prime Minister at the summit of the Security Council in January has pointed out that we must, we can implement this plan because the cold war confrontation is not there any more, we can prepone the date of 2010 to the year 2000. We are committed to the non-proliferation. We are committed to peace and our position, however, is that the threat must be addressed in an effective manner and a piecemeal solution is no solution. I thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR): The House is adjourned till tomorrow.

The House then adjoured at fifty-six minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 17th March, 1992.